

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, and 8-26 are pending in the application, with Claims 6-7 being withdrawn from consideration. The drawings are objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(c). Claims 1-5, 8-10, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in view of Wittstein et al. (US Patent 5,613,947). It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 11-23 are allowable.

Please cancel Claims 6 and 7 without prejudice. Please amend Claims 8 and 24 as set forth herein. No new matter has been added.

To overcome the objection to the drawings, attached hereto are amended Figs. 1 and 2 to include “PRIOR ART”.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 8, and 24 have been rejected as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art in view of Wittstein et al. (US Patent 5,613,947). More specifically, the Examiner states that the Admitted Prior Art in view of Wittstein et al. teaches all the recitations of these claims.

Regarding the Admitted Prior Art, Applicants respectfully disagrees that the Admitted Prior Art discloses or suggests the element of “*determining whether a service resumption request is generated* ” as recited in Claim 1. Nowhere in the Admitted Prior Art is there a discussion of a *service resumption request*; consequently, there can be no reasonable suggestion of the recitation *determining whether a service resumption request is generated*. Wittstein et al. fails to cure this deficiency of the Admitted Prior Art.

Accordingly, since the Admitted Prior Art in view of Wittstein et al. fails to disclose at least the recitation of *determining whether a service resumption request is generated*, Claim 1 is

believed to be allowable for at least this reason. Dependent Claims 2-5 are also allowable at least because they depend from Claim 1.

Claim 8 has been amended to include the recitation, determining whether a service resumption request is generated. As stated above with respect to Claim 1, the Admitted Prior Art does not teach or disclose determining whether a service resumption request is generated, and Wittstein et al. fails to cure this deficiency of the Admitted Prior Art.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the recitation determining whether a service resumption request is generated, which as stated above, is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of the Admitted Prior Art and Wittstein et al.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 8, and 24 are allowable over the Admitted Prior Art, Wittstein et al., or any combination thereof. While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-5, 9-10, and 25-26 are also allowable for at least the above reasons.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 24 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability *per se* of dependent Claims 2-5, 9-10, 25 and 26, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5, 9-10, 25 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5, and 8-26, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/MJM/dr